

**GOVERNMENT OF TELANGANA
ABSTRACT**

Public Servants – PR&RD Dept. – Allegations of irregularities in tender notification & Execution of works taken up under R&R Grant, Jinnaram (M), PRI SD Patancheru, PRI Division, Sangareddy, Medak District – Sri G.Venu Madhav Rao, the then EE, PRI Division, Sangareddy - Disciplinary proceedings under Rule 20 of Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification, Control & Appeal) Rules, 1991 (Telangana Adaptation) Order, 2016– Article of charges – Issued.

PANCHAYAT RAJ & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (VIG.I) DEPARTMENT

G.O.RT.No. 686

Dated: 07-10-2016

ORDER:

It is proposed to hold an enquiry against Sri G.Venu Madhav Rao, the then EE, PRI Division, Sangareddy, Medak District in accordance with the procedure laid down in Rule 20 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification, Control & Appeal) Rules, 1991 (Telangana Adaptation) Order, 2016.

2. The substance of the imputations of misconduct or misbehavior in respect of which the enquiry is proposed to be held is set out in the enclosed statement of article of charges (Annexure-I). A list of documents by which and a list of witnesses by whom, the article of charges are proposed to be sustained are also enclosed (Annexure-II&III).
3. Sri G.Venu Madhav Rao, the then EE, PRI Division, Sangareddy, is directed to submit within ten (10) days of the receipt of this order, a written statement of his defence.
4. Sri G.Venu Madhav Rao, the then EE, PRI Division, Sangareddy, is informed that an enquiry will be held only in respect of article of those charges as are not admitted. He should, therefore, specifically admit or deny each article of charge.
5. Sri G.Venu Madhav Rao, the then EE, PRI Division, Sangareddy, is further informed that if he does not submit his written statement of defence on or before the Period specified in Para 3 above or otherwise fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of Rule 20 of Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification, Control & Appeal) Rules, 1991 (Telangana Adaptation) Order, 2016 or the orders / directions issued in pursuance of the said rules, the Inquiring Authority may hold the inquiry against him ex-parte.
6. Sri G.Venu Madhav Rao, the then EE, PRI Division, Sangareddy, is invited to Rule 24 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964 (Telangana Adaptation) Order, 2016, under which no Government Servant shall bring or attempt to bring any political or outside influence to bear upon any superior authority to further his interest in respect of matters pertaining to his service under the Government. If any representation is received on his behalf from another person in respect of any matter dealt within these proceedings, it will be presumed that Sri G.Venu Madhav Rao, the then EE, PRI Division, Sangareddy, is aware of such a representation and that it has been made at his instance and action will be taken against him for violation of Rule-24 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964 (Telangana Adaptation) Order, 2016.
7. The receipt of this G.O. shall be acknowledged.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF TELANGANA)

S.P.SINGH
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

To
Sri G.Venu Madhav Rao, the then EE, PRI Division, Sangareddy, through
the Engineer-in-Chief, PR, Hyderabad.

P.T.O.

The Engineer-in-Chief, PR, Hyderabad.
(in duplicate with a request to serve and return the dated acknowledgement copy)
SF/SC

//FORWARDED ::BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEUXRE –I

(Annexure to G.O.Rt.No. , PR&RD (Vig.I) Deptt., dt.07.10.2016)

STATEMENT OF ARTICLES OF CHARGES FRAMED AGAINST SRI G.VENU MADHAV RAO, THE THEN EE, PRI DIVISION, SANGAREDDY, NOW WORKING AT ANDHOLE, MEDAK CIRCLE

CHARGES:

That the said Sri G.Venu Madhav Rao, the then EE, PRI Division, Sangareddy now working at Andhole, Medak circle has not followed the tender process as per the departmental procedures and allowed substandard execution of works taken up under R&R grant – Jinnaram (M) PRI Sub-division Patancheru, PRI division Sangareddy. He has allowed less quality and less quantity of various item of works in execution of works and releasing of payments were made from his office. He has failed to discharge his legitimate duties and shown negligence in performing of works right from the preparation of estimates, maintaining of records, quality maintained in execution on works and non production of records to the enquiry officer which resulting financial loss to the Government exchequer.

Basis:

The Executive Engineer, PR, Vigilance and Quality Control, Hyderabad has conducted an enquiry on substandard execution of works taken up under R&R grant – Jinnaram (M) PRI Sub-division Patancheru, PR division Sangareddy and reported that the Officer has committed irregularities in tender process, execution of works and releasing of payments. The details of various deficiencies are as follows. The Executive Engineer, PR, Vigilance and Quality Control, Hyderabad has proposed total recovery of all the works mentioned below of Rs.80,61,375/- through his reports dt:30-05-2015, 20-03-2016.

Tender Process:-

- ❖ 1st tender notification was issued by the then Executive Engineer, PRI Sangareddy vide Tender notice No.T1/26/works/2013-14,dated:13.02.2014, but was not published in news papers thus has not provide vide publicity and failed to act as per instructions to be followed in tendering process.
- ❖ For all the 23 works listed in the above tender notice EMD (1%) was not collected at the time issuing applications, which is against guidelines, and agreements were concluded on 03.03.2014 with a proposal of deducting 2 ½ % EMD from the respective 1st work bills.
- ❖ Documents related to 1st tender files and correspondence such as the details of no. of applications received for each tender with valid cost of tender schedule, EMD Sales tax are not maintained / updated by the Executive Engineer, PR, Sangareddy which is an irregularity.
- ❖ 2nd Tender notice No.T1/01/2010, dated:29.11.2014, issued by the then EE, PRI, Sangareddy was published in local news paper, and 1% EMD was received along with the tender application. But the records are not maintained (The name of the news paper in which it is published, date of publication).
- ❖ By verifying the total tender process conducted by the then EE, PRI, Sangareddy, for 51 works out of 53 of his level, 32 works are entrusted after evaluation. All the 32 works are entrusted at estimated rates inspite of conducting tenders in secret tender process which raises doubts in integrity of the officers concerned.

P.T.O.

::2::

- ❖ All the electricity works 9 no's (Sl.No 34 to 42) are not entrusted to any executing agency, but the works are grounded without entrustment and are at different stages.
- ❖ Two PWSS works (Sl.No.48 & Sl.No.49) are grounded (Construction of sump completed) without entrustment to any executing agency.
- ❖ The tender procedure followed in the 1st tender (for 23 works) by the then Executive Engineer, PRI Sangareddy, Violates the standard procedures and appears to be a fabricated on record.
- ❖ The process adopted in 2nd tender notice by the then Executive Engineer, PRI Sangareddy is also seems doubtful due to non furnishing of records (hiding of records) for verification at the time of inquiry.
- ❖ Six works of the 1st administrative sanction are modified by splitting them into 28 works, by the District Collector, Medak to bring in the competency of the EE, PRI, Sangareddy. Time limit was fixed to complete the tender process & Complete the works by 10.07.2014. Tenders were not called/deliberately delayed by the EE, till 29.11.2014 without any specific reason. Due to the abnormal delay the objective of splitting of estimates is defeated.
- ❖ As per the Government instructions, splitting of estimates of the same work for administrative and technical convenience is highly irregular and the then EE, PRI, Sangareddy, has failed to properly guide the District Collector in circulating the files for modified administrative sanction.
- ❖ As per the practice in the Department the grant under R&R program is to be released to the PAO, Medak for payments. Instead the grant was released to the then EE, PRI, Sangareddy and payments were made from his office. If the payments were made through the PAO, most of the procedural lapses could have been avoided.

Work SI.No.1,2:-

- As per the available records Rs.1.00 Lakh advance is given to the agency vide DEE, Lr.No.DEE/PTC/PR-Kistaipally R&R/1/Dt:20.02.2014, But the same advance is not deducted by the AEE while making payment.
- Income Tax is not deducted from the work bills.

Work SI.No.3,4,5,6&7 :-

- For the above leveling of ground works the AEE failed to arrive at the correct quantities on the basis of contour survey. The field staff has not furnished the relevant records for the above works regarding leveling of the ground cutting and filling for verification. For which the payment was made of Rs.9.28 Lakhs each work. The total expenditure is Rs.46.40 lakhs.
- The AEE has failed to establish TBMs, Taking levels at various grid points, and assessing the quantities required for cutting and filling.
- Areas of earth work in cutting and areas of earth work in filling are not clearly demarcated in layout plan.
- The rate given for earth work in cutting using machinery and transportation up to 1 km distance and dumping is Rs.74.92/Cum(as per approved data). The quantity that is available from earth work in cutting ie., 39593.00 cum be utilized for filling the required low lying area.

Work SI.No. 8,9,10,11,12,13 & 14 :-

(contd..on page 3)

- The AEE has failed to utilize 15,838 cum (Excess quantity of earth work in cutting) for formation of road.
- The AEE has allowed a rate of Rs.153.03/cum for earth work excavation for embankment and Rs.485.06/cum for GSB allowing the same material for earth work embankment and GSB. He has allowed an excess rate of Rs.332.01/Cum resulting in a loss to the Government of Rs.8,96,698/- towards 2700.80 cum of GSB executed at site.
- There is an excess recording of GSB, is observed in work no.14, to an excess quantity of 150.00 cum. 149596/- is recorded in excess of the actual work.
- In work no.12 shortfall in length of GSB and a recovery of Rs.5,822.00.
- Road no.13 is recorded twice in work no 12 &13 resulting an excess quantity of 142.80 cum and an excess cost of Rs.1,38,534/-.

Work Sl.No. 15:-

- Shortfalls observed in metal layer (Oversize & Quantity) recovery is as follows.
- Recovery proposed for over size and less quantity.....Rs.1,52,257/-
- Recovery proposed for over size in Road no: IV part and V road – Rs.5,080/-
- The material used for shoulders & Side earth is same. Hence the difference cost of material may be recovered.

Work Sl.No. 16:- Recovery due to over size in metal Rs.7,600/-

Work Sl.No. 17:- Recovery due to over size in metal Rs.596/-

Work Sl.No. 18:- Recovery due to over size in metal Rs.712/-

Work Sl.No. 21:- As per the report of the EE, PR Sangareddy, Rs.8,87,000/- payment of Rs.8.87 Lakhs is made for the work.
The AEE willfully has not furnished the Records for verification.

Work Sl.No. 23:- Under ground drainage work. The Length of 300 mm dia SWG pipe line and the number of manholes are not tallied with the MBook, resulting in a recovery of Rs.7191/-

Work Sl.No. 25:- Under ground drainage work. The Length of 300 mm dia SWG pipe line and short fall is observed in number of manholes and recovery is proposed. Rs.35,955/-

Work Sl.No. 29:- Under ground drainage work 34.10mts Shortfall in Length of 300mm dia SWG Pipe line is observed Rs.2,00,596/-
And Short fall in Number of manholes are also observed (5 no's)

Work Sl.No. 31:- Under ground drainage work 90.70mts Shortfall in Length of 300mm dia SWG Pipe line is observed Rs.3,42,280/-
and Number of manholes are tailed recovery is proposed.

Work Sl.No. 33:- Length of SWG Pipe line is repeated for Two times Rs.5,91,458/-
resulting in excess payment. Hence to be recovered. But shortfall in No.of manholes is observed (36 nos)
Recovery is proposed for the same.

Work Sl.No. 34 to 42:- The estimates pertaining to electricity lines, Transformers and meters are not sanctioned by the competent authority.
The works are not entrusted to any agency, But works are grounded and are at different stages.

Work Sl.No. 50 to 51:- The estimates for the works are not technically sanctioned, agreements are not concluded. But Work was allowed at the site, there is already a Sump constructed at the site and is completed.

WORK WISE ABSTRACT OF RECOVERY CALCULATIONS
R&R Programme Kistaipally in Jinnaram (M), PRI Sub-Division,
Patancheru, Medak District.

Sl. No	Description of work	Nature of work	Deficiency noticed	Amount of recovery(in Rs.)
1	2	3	4	5
1	Work Nos in the list communicated by the EE (PR) Sangareddy:3,4,5,6,7	Levelling of the ground cutting filling	Non production of the records	46,40,000
2	Works Nos:8,9,10,11,12,13,14	Formation of internal roads	Towards difference in cost of GSB Material and side earth.	8,96,698
3	Work No:14	Formation of internal roads	Excess recording of GSB	1,49,596
4	Work No:12	Formation of internal roads	Shortfall in length of GSB	5822
5	Work No:12&13	Formation of internal roads	Excess recording of GSB	1,38,534
6	Work No:15	Metalling of internal roads	GR II metal O/size and less quantity	1,52,257
			O/Size in road no:IV Part and V road	5080
7	Work No:16	Metalling of internal roads	O/size in GR II metal	7600
8	Work No:17	Metalling of internal roads	O/size in GR II metal	596
9	Work No:18	Metalling of internal roads	O/size in GR II metal	712
10	Work No:21	Metalling of internal roads	Non furnishing of the records	8,87,000
11	Work No:23	Underground drainage with SWG pipes	Shortfall in no. of manholes.	7191
12	Work No:25	Underground drainage with SWG pipes	Shortfall in no. of manholes.	35,955
13	Work No:29	Underground drainage with SWG pipes	Shortfall in length of SWG pipelines	2,00,596
14	Work No:30	Underground drainage with SWG pipes	Shortfall in length of SWG pipelines	3,42,280
15	Work No:33	Underground drainage with SWG pipes	Excess recording of SWG pipe line & Manholes.	5,91,458
Total Amount of Recovery in Rs.				80,61,375/-

The irregularities identified in tender process, execution of work and release of payments sanctioned under R&R works in Jinnaram (M), Patancheru SD of Medak district and also non production of records for the leveling works, which resulting the financial loss to the Government exchequer of Rs.80,61,375/-

The inaction of the Delinquent officer amounts to violation of Rule (3) of AP Civil Services (Conduct) Rules 1964 (Telangana Adaptation) Order, 2016 thereby he exhibited lack of integrity and devotion to duty unbecoming of Government servant.

Hence the Charge.

S.P.SINGH
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE II

(Annexure to G.O.Rt.No. , PR&RD (Vig.I) Deptt., dt.07.10.2016)

LIST OF DOCUMENTS BY WHICH THE ARTICLES OF CHARGES ARE PROPOSED AGAINST SRI G.VENUMADHAV RAO, THE THEN EE, PRI DIVISION SANGAREDDY NOW WORKING AT ANDHOLE, MEDAK CIRCLE, TO BE SUSTAINED.

1) Lr.No.AEE2/R&R Inp/2015, dt:30.05.2015 of EE (PR) V&QC division, Hyderabad.

2)Lr.No.QC2/AEE/V&QC Division, Hyderabad/15-16, dt:20.03.2016 of Executive Engineer V&QC Hyderabad.

S.P.SINGH
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE II

(Annexure to G.O.Rt.No. , PR&RD (Vig.I) Deptt., dt.07.10.2016)

LIST OF WITNESSES BY WHOM THE ARTICLES OF CHARGES ARE PROPOSED AGAINST SRI G.VENUMADHAV RAO, THE THEN EE, PRI DIVISION SANGAREDDY NOW WORKING AT ANDHOLE, MEDAK CIRCLE, TO BE SUSTAINED.

-NIL-

S.P.SINGH
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SECTION OFFICER